

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/965,356	11/06/1997	MERTON BERNFIELD	CMCC533	3832
75	90 09/23/2002			
PATREA L PABST ARNOALL GOLDEN & GREGORY LLP 2800 ONE ATLANTIC CENTER			EXAMINER	
			FALK, ANNE MARIE	
1201 WEST PEACHTREET STREET ATLANTA, GA 303093450			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
, -			1632	るい
			DATE MAILED: 09/23/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		File
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	08/965,356	BERNFIELD ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Anne-Marie Baker, Ph.D.	1632
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 01 May 2001 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: ( condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice  I) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection.  E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  36(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) $oxed{\boxtimes}$ they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);
(b) $\square$ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	pelow);	
(c)	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to: 6 and 15.		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 3-5, 10, and 12-14</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·
10. Other:		Anne-Marie Baker ANNE-MARIE BAKER PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) , 08/965,356



The proposed claim amendments would require new grounds of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because the claims recite a broad term and a narrow term within the same claim and therefore the claim language is confusing and the scope of the claim is unclear. Both Claims 6 and 15 recite "a transgenic rodent" as well as "the genotype FVB/N-TgN(synd-1)." However, the term FVB refers to a specific mouse strain and therefore recitation of the broader term "rodent" is incongruent with this limitation. Furthermore, Claim 6 recites the phrase "maturity onset obesity having the genotype FVB/N-TgN(synd-1)." This claim language is indefinite because the phrase "having the genotype FVB/N-TgN(synd-1)" is in the wrong place in the sentence. It is modifying the term "obesity" rather than the term "rodent." Thus, the proposed amendments to the claim language renders the claims indefinite and the claims would not be allowable in their present form.

\_